(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.)

ಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಆ ಬಂಡವಾಳ ಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಷರೀಕಾಗಿ ಏನೋ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಬರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಿಂದ ಬರ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೈ ಬಿಟ್ಟಲ್ಲ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಬಹಳ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಈಗ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಧಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರ ಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿಕೊಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಾವು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ನತ್ಯಾಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Labour Housing (Amendment) Bill, 1955, as passed by the Legislative Council be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE CIVIL COURTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next Bill—the Mysore Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1955.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home).—Will we be able to complete this Bill to-day? I only preface it for this reason that we have the Second Five Year Plan, which, I am sure the House will agree with me, will be an important matter for discussion before this House, In order to give more time for the discussion of that Plan, even if it is a little late to-day I am only making a suggestion and requesting that this Bill may be given a passage to-day only. I have nothing more to say except that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will be over. So far as these provisions are concerned, I think the Hon'ble Members are agreeable to them. We are also anxious to give effect to this measure.

Motion to consider.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1955, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

The main purpose for which this Bill has been introduced is catalogued in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the financial implication of which also has been clarified. In a sense as to why this amendment was thought of is for this reason. We have all been stating from a long time that there must be separation of the Judiciary from the Executive. As a matter of fact, this is not a new question. This question was engaging the attention of the Government from a very long time. I believe in the year 1948 the High Court gave a Note expressing their opinion about this matter. The purpose is to create a new class of Civil Judges called the Civil Judge with a view to invest him with the powers of a District Magistrate. According to the present Civil Courts Act, there are only four categories of Civil Judges. It is now proposed to have another category called the Civil Judge and taking advantage of the situation, to effect suitable changes as advised by the High Court regarding the pecuniary and the appellate jurisdiction of various Courts. The idea is to have a Civil Court analogous more or less to the status of a District Magistrate, who must have all the powers of a District Magistrate except those coming under the security proceedings under certain specified Chapters of the Criminal Procedure Code.

4 P.M.

As it is, the House knows all the Magistrates in the District are subordinate to the District Magistrate. He has the powers of revision. He has also powers of appeal against the judgment and orders of the Second Class Magistrate. It is desired to divest him of all the judiciary powers. It is also proposed that these civil judges may be invested with that power. Sir, I do not wish to take much time of this Hon'ble House. With a view to give effect to the recommendations of Mallappa Committee's findings and also with a view to give effect to the advice tendered by the High Court as early as

1948 and in consonance with that advice, this Bill has been prepared. I wish, Sir, the House will give its unanimous approval to this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1955, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

*Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I oppose this Bill. Sir, in the year 1953, the Government appointed a Committee to go into the question of reorganisation of the Civil Courts in the State of Mysore and that Committee is known as Mallappa Committee. The Mallappa Committee have made specific recommendations and the report has been circulated to all of us. The summary of the recommendations are contained in pages 88 to 91 of the said Report. In the preamble to this Amendment Bill, the Government have been pleased to state that the recommendations of the Mallappa Committee have also been taken into consideration and in order to implement those recommendations, this Bill is placed before us. Sir, I submit that the provisions of the Bill are contrary to the recommendations of the Mallappa Committee. I will go into the question in detail. Secondly, Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the much advertised principle of separation of the Judiciary from the Executive is also put in. There is no provision in the Bill which gives us the assurance that it will be done so. will I deal with the question in detail. At the outset, I take clause 2 of the Bill. Clause 2 of the Bill reads as follows:—

"2. Substitution of new section for section 3 of Mysore Act I of 1883.—For section 3 of the Mysore Civil Courts Act, 1883 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), the following section shall be substituted, namely:—

'3. Class and designation of Courts.—Besides the High Court of Mysore, there shall be five classes of Civil Courts, namely:—

Firstly, the District Court, Secondly, the Court of the Civil Judge, Thirdly, the Court of the Subordinate Judge, Fourthly, the Court of the Munsiff, Fifthly, the Court of Small Causes'."

By this Bill, we are creating a new class of courts called the Court of Civil Judges. They say it is in accordance with the recommendations of the Mallappa Committee. It is true that the Mallappa Committee have recommended as follows:—

"Having in view the necessity to afford relief both to the District Courts and to the Subordinate Judges' Courts and to give effect to the scheme of separation of the Judiciary from the Executive, the Committee proposes the creation of a new cadre of judicial officers who will be Judicial District Magistrates *cum* Civil Judges."

Now, nowhere in the Bill it is stated that the Civil Judges will be empowered with the powers of the District Magistrate. The Government may immediately reply to this by stating that since it has been provided under the Criminal Procedure Code, it cannot be provided here because this Act relates to civil courts. "A provision like that cannot be provided here"—that might be the answer. But at the same time we would like to know whether it is not possible to place before this House an amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code to fulfil this idea.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—To cut short discussion, I may say, today we have got Sessions Judges. Can you show me anywhere in the Civil Courts Act where a 'Sessions Judge' has been defined? We do that under the powers of notification under the Criminal Procedure Code. We cannot do it otherwise. That is the only way of doing it. After the Civil Judge has been appointed, the Government will by notification say that he will be the District Magistrate and invest him with the powers of District Magistrate.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I will presently come to that. Even now, the Hon'ble Minister says they have power to vest any powers of a

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

District Magistrate. There is absolutely no difference of opinion on that account. We have today only three District Courts in the State; one is at Bangalore, one at Mysore and another one at Shimoga. If they have to establish civil judges in every district, as they have stated in their Objects and Reasons, then we will have 10 District Courts. It is certainly an additional expenditure. As it is, we have Subordinate Judges' Courts in every district, except three. If the Government desire to separate the judiciary from the executive, nothing prevents them by empowering Subordinate Judges in the District and fulfil the object of separation of the judiciary from the executive. Subordinate Judges are sufficiently experienced, and under the existing provision, nothing prevents the Government to empower these Subordinate Judges in all these Districts except three with the power of District Magistrate, and thereby achieve this object. Why Mallappa Committee recommended the creation of Civil Judge is to relieve the congestion in the District Courts. There are now three District Courts. By suitable changes in the pecuniary jurisdiction and the territorial jurisdiction, we can certainly reduce the pressure of work in the District Courts. It is not necessary to bring into existence another class of courts, thereby incurring an expenditure of nearly Rs. 1 lakh. Sir, the administration of justice costs us today Rs. 31.72 lakhs. The revenue from the administration of justice is of the order of Rs. 7·77 lakhs. From the year 1952-53, the administration of justice costs us only Rs. 27.70 lakhs, and in 1955-56, it is Rs. 31.72 lakhs, thereby registering an increase of nearly Rs. 4 lakhs for a revenue of Rs. 7.7 lakhs. In the administration of justice, I do not mean to say that we must have a revenue to equate the expenditure. That is not the intention. We are spending already heavily and to commit us further, I think, is not correct. Sir, the other argument is, suppose the Subordinate Judges are empowered with the powers of a District Magistrate. I think they are First Class Magistrates now. Mallappa Committee has also suggested the reorganisation of the pecuniary jurisdiction and territorial jurisdiction. According to Section 10 of the principal Act,

> "the jurisdiction of a Munsiff shall extend to all like suits and proceedings, not otherwise exempted from his jurisdiction, of which the amount or value of the subject-matter does not exceed Rs. 1,000: Provided that the Government of Mysore may, whenever it deems fit, and within such local limits as it may, from time to time, prescribe, enhance the pecuniary limit of such jurisdiction upto Rs. 2,500."

Sir, as it stands today, the pecuniary jurisdiction of a Munsiff is Rs. 2,500. The Bill seeks to enhance it to Rs. 3,000. The change is only for Rs. 500. The reasoning advanced by Mallappa Committee was inflation. If pecuniary jurisdiction should be enhanced, it should be enhanced ten-fold. Because, in 1883 when Civil Court was introduced, the value of the land was Rs. 100 per acre of wet land; today it is nearly Rs. 2,000. So, let us not take the mathematical calculation of inflation. Since the territorial jurisdiction has also been re-organised, since most of the taluk headquarters having a population of one lakh and more will have a Munsiff Court, it is but right that we must enhance the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Munsiff to Rs. 5,000. If we do so, we can reduce the pressure on the District Court. That is one thing. The second thing is, this Bill provides, for provision contrary to whatever the Mallappa Committee recommended. In respect of appeals, the Chair may be pleased to hear what Mallappa Committee has stated. They have stated that all appeals from Munsiff Courts should be heard by Civil Judges, that is, District Magistrates *cum* Civil Judges. Secondly, all appeals from Subordinate Judges, Civil Judges and District Judges should lie to the High Court. Now the Bill seeks to provide appeals from the Subordinate Judges' courts to the

District Courts. Mallappa Committee wanted to avoid that and the Bill provides for it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Member that I have not stated that we are implementing in entirety Mallappa Committee's Report? This was an improvement on the recommendation. Why do you put something in my mouth which I have not stated?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I have never said that the Government are committed to implement Mallappa Committee's Report. When they drafted this Bill, Mallappa Committee Report had not been considered by them. Sir, the most important recommendation of Mallappa Committee Report was this. While recommending the creation of a new class of judges called the District Magistrate *cum* Civil Judges, they have also laid down this principle and that is contained in page 8 of the Report.

Page 8 of the report:

> "It will be noticed that the above proposals are in accordance with the scheme proposed by the Government for completing the separation of the Judiciary from the Executive with this difference that the number of new appointments is minimised by replacing the courts of all Subordinate Judges *cum* First Class Magistrates by courts of District Magistrates *cum* Civil Judges."

We cannot understand from the Bill whether the Subordinate Judges' Courts now in existence in the rest of the districts are going to be replaced by these District Courts, by these courts of District Magistrates or not. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is quite clear that the Government are going to introduce courts of District Magistrates *cum* Civil Judges in all the districts. So we will not only have a District Magistrate's Court and a Civil Magistrate's Court in every district, but also a court of the Subordinate Judge. There is no proposal to reduce the number of courts. If I get the assurance from the Government that it is their intention to replace the Subordinate Judges Courts in districts other than Mysore, Shimoga and Bangalore by the District Judge *cum* Civil Judges' Courts, I have very little objection. But if it is the question of putting one more court where there is a Subordinate Judge's Court, I feel it is extra expenditure. If suppose these two courts come into existence, there is very little work for these courts. I do not think it is the intention of Government. I want to know from the Government whether they would replace the Subordinate Judges' Courts by these District Judges *cum* Civil Judges' Courts.

Sir, Clauses 7, 8, 9 and 14 deal with pecuniary jurisdiction. Clauses 11, 12 and 13 deal with appeals. Clause 6 deals with territorial jurisdiction of courts. As I have already suggested, I have tabled some amendments also in respect of pecuniary jurisdiction of courts. It is necessary that pecuniary jurisdiction of Munsiff is raised to that of 5,000 rupees, that of a Subordinate Judge to Rs. 15,000 and that of a Civil Judge to Rs. 25,000. If we do so, we can minimise the pressure. As regards territorial jurisdiction of these courts, the Mallappa Committee have no doubt made recommendations and most of the recommendations are well considered and I believe that the Government had expressed their opinion on this recommendation, *i.e.*, in respect of territorial jurisdiction. Sir, with these few observations, I submit to this House that the Government might take into consideration the points that I have just now raised.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—I welcome this measure. This is a very simple measure which my Hon'ble friend Sri. Srinivasa Iyengar has tried to complicate. If only he could agree with the dictum that justice delayed is justice denied, he would not have made all these complications in this Bill. Here all that is envisaged is to give speedy justice to the litigants. Separation of judiciary from the executive has all along been urged not because the executive judges would hamper justice but because the executive District

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

Magistrates with their numerous work, with other things, would not either be efficient or have sufficient time.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—We did not oppose it.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Who opposed the separation of the judiciary from the executive ?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is why I am saying that the Civil Judges are necessary. Why should we think of investing a Munsiff with a jurisdiction of Rs. 5,000 only or a Subordinate Judge with Rs. 10,000 ? What is there if he is invested with Rs. 20,000 ? After all we have to look to the status and the position and standing of the Subordinate Judge. You have to look to the efficiency and standard of a judge.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Is the efficiency of a judge judged by his pecuniary Civil jurisdiction ?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The efficiency of the judge depends on his experience and also on his status. Can we put a Munsiff as a High Court Judge ? As a person in the Judiciary goes on higher, he attains more and more experience. You may say why not entrust the Munsiff with Rs. 50,000 suit. The man who files a suit knows the difficulty. The status counts a lot. A Civil Judge is the person who is exclusively meant for that.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Exclusively meant for what ?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Exclusively meant for Civil Work and also to do all District Magistrate's work. The District Judges are exclusively doing legal work unlike a District Magistrate, who has to go and visit the Veterinary Hospital and all other work which the world can conceive of in addition to his magisterial work.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Why does a District Magistrate visit the Veterinary Hospital ?

(*Laughter*)

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Some villagers come and say to the Deputy Commissioner who is the District Magistrate also to come to his village and see the condition of his cattle. The District Magistrate has to do that. Here the object of appointing Civil Judges is to confine them to legal work only and to arrange for the necessary dispensation of justice. Therefore the object here is to relieve the District Magistrate also. In the whole of the State there are only three District Judge's Courts who have to deal with everything because a Subordinate Judge cannot be entrusted with higher financial suits than he is at present entrusted with. One of the reasons why Civil Judges have to be appointed is to give relief to the present three District Judges also, to a certain extent. We have been therefore urging for the appointment of a District Judge in each district to perform some portion of the functions to a limit of Rs. 50,000. If a Civil Judge is appointed—only one with sufficient experience will be appointed. He should be more experienced than a Subordinate Judge. A Subordinate judge is only next to the First Class Magistrate. Suppose there is a civil suit for Rs. 50,000. People will naturally first think whether he is capable and whether he is experienced, etc. That is the consideration. After all in these matters it is the litigant who will have to be satisfied. It is a feeling with the litigant that a man of greater status and better experience will look into his case with greater care and caution. Subordinate Judge, after all, is just a man above Munsiff's cadre.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—A District Judge is just a man after a Subordinate Judge !

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is why I said that a person appointed should have status and experience so as to relieve the congestion of the other courts, who can receive proper respect from the litigant public. At the same time it is very necessary that the District Magistrate's work has to be tackled by somebody. In which case, the Subordinate Judge with the present pressure of work cannot perform that. Even the Subordinate Judge has congestion of work at present. In several places, in addition to the Subordinate Judge, there are other Magistrates invested with First Class Magistrate's

powers in order to relieve the Subordinate Judge from some of his work. In that case, it is necessary by going half way, by giving powers to the tune of Rs. 20,000 and in special cases up to Rs. 50,000, not only with respect to suits but other proceedings like miscellaneous and insolvency proceedings and especially acquisition cases where every man has to run to Shimoga or to go through three districts so as to take his case before a judge in whom he can repose confidence, who has higher powers and status and at the same time acts as a spoke in the magisterial side. Therefore, Government have thought that this long felt want of having a Civil Judge at every district headquarters should be satisfied. If you pack the Sessions Judge with both the works, what happens is, he will not relieve the District Magistrate of his work. Why not you appoint a District Judge in each district you might ask. What happens is this. The congestion will never be removed. Even if it is 10,100, the suit will have to go to a higher judge. He will not have sufficient time to look into sessions work. Even the appeals to District Magistrates will have to go to him. You must know that the District Judge and the District Magistrate have concurrent jurisdiction. When we send an appeal or take stay orders. . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟಿನ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸಬ್ ಜಡ್ಜಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು; ಅದನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

4-30 P.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sri Hutche Gowda, I am an advocate and I may tell you that they have concurrent jurisdiction.

At present they have got concurrent jurisdiction.

It cannot be delegated to Subordinate Judges on account of the position, status and veneration accorded to District Magistrates.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—The veneration and other things are in your imagination.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It would be according to your imagination. But there are people who feel that a man with a higher status and position would be better. It would be an imagination from your point of view, but it is a question of confidence from the point of view of poor people. That is the point there. Therefore I feel that Subordinate Judges cannot be vested with such higher powers. A person who has better experience and who holds a higher status wold have better veneration. Besides, if District Judges are appointed in all the ten districts, expenses would also go very high. Such a provision is prevalent in other parts of India. Civil Judges are working in different parts of India. I submit that it is very necessary that a post will have to be created between the Subordinate Judge and a District Judge. The District Judges will have to be relieved of certain work of suits and proceedings, so that they might devote their attention to the criminal work, that is, the session work. So, in order to relieve them of the heavy work a new place has to be created in the district. This is a very good piece of legislation. The comments made by my other friends are but natural, because they belong to the opposition party.

I welcome the measure, Sir.

*Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY (Malur).—While welcoming this Bill wholeheartedly, I would like to say only a few words, Sir. The separation of the Judiciary from the Executive is overdue from a very long time in our State. I am glad that the Government have at last piloted this Bill. The other House has already accorded its approval to this, and now it has come before us.

The Bill only seeks to introduce a new set of courts, namely, the Court of the Civil Judges and at the same time opportunity is availed of to enhance the jurisdiction of the other civil courts. My friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar was saying that the powers of the Civil Judge may not be sufficient here and it requires to be amended. Of course, the Minister has already given a reply in that behalf. Under the Criminal Procedure Code the

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

Government have always power to appoint the District Magistrates.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—They have always the power to withdraw also.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—If they want the power to do and undo, there is no necessity for this amendment. For example, I may give an instance. The Sub-Judges are now the First Class Magistrates in all the District Headquarters. Under the Act of 1883, the Subordinate Judge is being appointed as Subordinate Judge and under the Criminal Procedure Code he is appointed as the First Magistrate. There are purely Subordinate Judges' Courts in our State. But in many places there are Sub Courts and also the First Class Magistrates' Courts. Therefore there is absolutely no necessity for introducing the Court of the Civil Judge.

With regard to the necessity for the appointment of Civil Judges in the various District Headquarters, my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik has already made out a very strong case.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Strength lies in repetition.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—Now these Civil Judges will be appointed as District Magistrates *cum* Civil Judges for all the courts of the Civil Judges in all the District Headquarters and the intention of separation of the Judiciary from the Executive was that the courts should purely be judicial and the Revenue officers should not have anything to do with the judicial matters. Now the Revenue District Magistrates will have only certain powers under the Criminal Procedure Code, namely, security proceedings and so on. But, with regard to the appellate and revisional powers as contemplated under the Criminal Procedure Code, it is the Civil Judge *cum* District Magistrate that will be having powers. We have now good many cases decided by the Revenue Magistrates; the work that was being attended to by the Revenue District Magistrates hitherto will hereafter be disposed of by the District Magistrate *cum* Civil Judge. He will have both the appellate powers and also the revisional powers. Again Sir, he has been given sufficient responsibility also; his powers are enhanced also. His jurisdiction is enhanced to the tune of Rs. 20,000 and the High Court whenever it thinks it necessary may enhance it to the extent of Rs. 50,000. When the District Magistrates are to be appointed, my friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar was submitting that instead of creating a V class of Courts involving heavy expenditure and all that, the same work could have been got done through the Subordinate Judges *cum* First Class Magistrates. But my submission is, the First Class Magistrates are now subordinate to the Revenue District Magistrate with regard to certain powers, like revisional inspection and certain other matters. Therefore, now the new Judicial Magistrates that are going to be appointed, should have a power and status equivalent to the powers and status of the Revenue District Magistrate. The Judicial Magistrates should not in any way be subordinate to the Revenue District Magistrate. Moreover, a provision has been made for appeals being heard by these District Magistrates from the Munsiffs' Courts. I therefore submit that it is very necessary that these District Magistrates should have certain status and power and prestige, if not more, at least equal to the power and prestige of the Revenue District Magistrates. The Hon'ble the Minister for Home was submitting that this Bill is intended partly to implement the Mallappa Committee Report. No doubt the pecuniary jurisdiction of some of the Civil Courts has been implemented, but in view of the fact that there is a lot of conjestion in the courts, the Sub-Courts and in the Munsiffs' Courts and in various other courts, it was very necessary that all the recommendations that have been made in the Mallappa Committee Report are implemented as early as possible. With these few words, I welcome this Bill.

*Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Sir, while welcoming this Bill, I want a few points to be clarified by the Hon'ble the Minister who is incharge of this Bill. The Statement of Objects

and Reasons has amplified the fact that the amendment of this Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill has been necessitated as a consequence of the report of Sri Mallappa Committee. But to my mind, few doubts are still lingering, and I request the Hon'ble the Minister incharge of this Bill to explain those doubts. The one unanimous opinion that probably was heard throughout the length and breadth of this House was that whenever there was a motion to the effect that the Judiciary should be separated from the Executive, that a complete divesting of the power from the Executive of judicial matters should be there. But as it is, the Bill only contemplates to take away the judicial powers of the District Magistrates and to vesting them with the V Class Magistrates *i.e.*, the Civil Judges. But in addition to the powers that are being sought to be transferred to the Civil Judges under this amending Bill, even the civil matters also are vested in them. That is, of course, a welcome measure and a provision has been made by which the congestion of cases in different courts would be rationally adjusted. But that apart, I want to know why the Government or the reasons why the Government was not in a mood to divest the Assistant Commissioners also of the judicial powers.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If my Hon'ble friend permits me, it would be better to clarify the doubt at this early stage so that he may understand the Government's position. The intention of the Government is to divest these Magistrates of the judicial powers as such, but not all. Do not forget that. There are certain sections under the Criminal Procedure Code, namely, Chapters 8 to 12 where the power is still to be continued with the District Magistrates for purposes of security, maintenance of law and order. What we propose doing is only with regard to judicial powers.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Even there, for purposes of maintaining law and order and security of the community concerned, of course, the Hon'ble the Home Minister was pleased to say that certain chapters are still there which vest the powers with the District Magistrates. But here the matter seems to be a bit confused. Because the First Class Magistrates, if I am not wrong, they are also oftentimes called upon to maintain law and order, and that is the reason why probably never there is a day on which the First Class Magistrate might absent himself from the Headquarters in which he is posted to work as a Magistrate.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The High Court themselves have examined this question. They have recommended that it is very necessary that the District Magistrates must still be vested with powers. They should not be divested of powers under Chapters 8 to 12 of the Criminal Procedure Code in respect of maintenance of law and order. As a matter of fact, they have got a very nice quotation there which says that so far as that position is concerned, there is no doubt about it. That is what is prevailing in Bombay, Madras and various other States. It is better you understand—I am sorry to say it is better I clarify that the position is the same elsewhere.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Let the House be apprised of the quotation.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will read it if you want. So far as that position is concerned, whether the District Magistrate should still be vested with powers under Chapters 8 to 12, what they say is—this is a very pertinent observation:

> "In times of serious disturbances endangering public safety, to ensure prompt and effective action being taken, to put down such movements it is necesary that the executive head of the District who has control over the Police whose assistance is quite essential for that purpose should have the power under Chapters 8 to 12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and all the powers of a District Magistrate under special enactments, bearing in mind the following words of Lord Chancellor Bacon: "Judges ought to be above all. . . . The safety of the people is the highest law."

Sri M. LINGANNA.—The Chapter now read is of course a very strong argument in favour of retaining the power in the hands of the heads of the districts and to some extent in the hands of Assistant Commissioners. Probably the occasions for such an exercise of power by the District Magistrates would be few and far between. If such an occasion were to arise very rarely no doubt, the safety of the community or of the people is of the paramount importance. I merely want the Government, even Governments of other States, to retain those powers because then it will not be complete separation of the judiciary from the hands of the executive. The mere taking away from the hands of the District Magistrate of the powers of revision on the orders or the judgments given by the First Class Magistrate may be. . . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Supervisory power, power of control, powers of appeal, powers of revision, all these things will be taken away. Nothing will be left over. The First Class Magistrate or the Sub-Judge will have nothing to do with the District Magistrate.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I will not pursue the matter any further.

But the one other aspect which calls for some remark is about the partial implementation of the recommendations of the Committee headed by Sri Mallappa who was also a Judge of the High Court. Here the Government seems to be reluctant or rather it may take its own time, to implement other recommendations. So far as the territorial jurisdiction is concerned, there is an effective Chapter therein, which also is of paramount importance. It is as important as the separation of the judiciary from the executive. Because it is brought home to the Government by several Hon'ble Members of this august House that by irrational territorial division, some parts of the State are put to a lot of difficulties and therefore I submit as a passing remark that the Government also should make up their mind in implementing that part of the recommendation of Sri Mallappa Committee Report.

With these few words I wholeheartedly welcome this amending Bill.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನೇನೂ ಲಾಯರ್ ಅಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೂ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಲಾಯರಿಗಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು ಏರ್ಪಾಡಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ಕ್ಲೈಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಏರ್ಪಾಡಾಗಿವೆ. ಇವುಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಹತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆಯೆಂದು ಮೆಮೊರ್ಯಾಂಡಂನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು, ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು, ನಬಾರ್ಡಿನೇಟ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್, ಮುನಿಸಿಫ್ಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾರ್‌ಕಾಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ I ಕ್ಲಾಸ್, II ಕ್ಲಾಸ್, III ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಅಡಿಷನಲ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು ಬೇರೆ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಉಳಿತಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಾದುನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ ಸೂಟುಗಳ ಜೂರಿಸ್‌ಡಿಕ್ಷನ್ನನ್ನು ನಬಾರ್ಡಿನೇಟ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗತಾನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಲಿಂಗಾರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಗೃಹಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ಈ ನಬ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಅಪೀಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್‌ಗಳ ಸೂಪರ್‌ವಿಜನ್ನಿಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—What I submitted was that at present the First Class Magistrate is subordinate to the District Magistrate in that the District Magistrate can send up certain appeals now for decision by the First Class Magistrate, and also the District Magistrate can hear certain cases that come up by way of revision from the First Class Magistrate to the District Magistrate's Court, and again for inspection and certain other matters the First Class Magistrate will be subordinate to the District Magistrate. That is all I submitted. That is the position hitherto, but in the future set up it will not be so. There will be a Civil Judge *cum* District Magistrate. That is what I was submitting. I did not say that the Sub-Judges would be subordinate to the District Magistrate.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಹೆಡ್‌ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಬಾರ್ಡಿನೇಟ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್‌ಗಳಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಬಾರ್ಡಿನೇಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಅವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ

ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಸಂಬಳದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಹೋಗಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೊಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ಸ್ ಬರುವಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೇನೂ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನೇ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡಿದರಾಯಿತು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಈಗ ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಜನ ಜಡ್‌ಜಿಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಮತ್ತು ಒಬ್ಬ ಫಸ್ಟ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಮುನಿಸಿಫ್ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ 15-20 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೆಲ್ಲ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಅದು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದುದು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರೇ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು. ಇನ್ನೂ ಮೊನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇವು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದವು. ಈಗ ಅವರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗಿಂತಲೂ ಬಹಳ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಈಗ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಾದರೋ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಹೆಮ್ಮೆತರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಈ ಜುಡಿಷಿಯರಿಯನ್ನು ಎಗ್ಸಿಕ್ಯುಟೀವ್‌ನಿಂದ ಬೇರ್ಪಡಿಸುವಾಗ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕೇಡರ್‌ಅನ್ನು ಕಮ್ಮಿಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಉಚಿತ. ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಬಾರ್ಡಿನೇಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಕೆಲವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವಹಿಸಬಹುದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಕೇಡರನ್ನು ಕಮ್ಮಿ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುವುದು. ಹಾಗೆ ಸಂಬಳದ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಮಾಡಲು ಹೊರಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ 20 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟು ಜಡ್‌ಜಿಗಳಿಗೆ 5 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳವಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಅದು 50 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಧಾರಣೆವಾಸಿಗಳೂ ಈಗ ಏರಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ತೊಲ ಭಂಗಾರಕ್ಕೆ 18-20 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿತ್ತು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅದೇ ಒಂದು ತೊಲ ಭಂಗಾರಕ್ಕೆ 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬೆಲೆಯಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಕಡಮೆಯಾದರೆ ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್‌ಗಳ ಅಂತಸ್ತು ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನೂ ತಿರುಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕೇಡರನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿರುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನ ಜೂರಿಸ್‌ಡಿಕ್ಷನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ನಾಲು ಜಡ್‌ಜಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಒಂದೇ ಕಡೆ ತಾವು ಹಾಕುವುದಾದರೆ ದೊಡ್ಡದೊಡ್ಡ ಲಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪಟ್ಟಣವಾಸಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಇತರ ಲಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹವೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರೈತರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ಅವರು ಕಡಮೆ ಖರ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹತ್ತಿರದಲ್ಲೇ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ರೈತರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮೀಪವಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಖರ್ಚುಪೆಚ್ಚುಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತವೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು.

5 P M.

ಅಂದರೆ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬ Munsiff-Magistrate ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಷ್ಟು Magistrates ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ತುಮಕೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ First Munsiff, Second Munsiff ಮತ್ತು Additional Munsiff ಹೀಗೆ ಮೂರು ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು ಇವೆ. ತಿಪಟೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳಿವೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಬೇರೆಕಡೆಯೂ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗಲಿ, ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕಲಿ ಎಂಬುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೇ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು Subordinate Judges ಗೆ ವಹಿಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಈಗ ಇರುವ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇರುವ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು adjust ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ, ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಬೇಕು, ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER. – May I know how many speakers are there ?

(*Several Members rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will take up further discussion on this Bill tomorrow. The House will now rise and meet again at 8-30 A.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock on Saturday, the 22nd October 1955.

WD 1451—GPB—550—12-1-56